



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,684	09/30/2003	Arthur Louis Gaetano JR.	IT-03-005	6726
40604 7590 04/26/2010 MITEL NETWORKS CORPORATION MICHELLE WHITTINGTON, ESQ. 7300 WEST BOSTON STREET CHANDLER, AZ 85226				
EXAMINER WORJLOH, JALATIE				
ART UNIT 3685		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/26/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,684

Applicant(s)

GAETANO ET AL.

Examiner

Jalatee Worjloh

Art Unit

3685

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed January 19, 2010.
2. Claims 1-5 and 7-35 are pending.
3. Claims 1-5 and 7-9 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments filed January 19, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
5. Applicants argue that Russell fails to teach a personal inventory of intangible software components selected for storage because each of said components is for operating with said target hardware device.

At least claim 1 recites "said virtual warehouse having a storage comprising a personal inventory of intangible software components selected for storage because each of said components is compatible for operating said target hardware device". The Examiner notes that the feature "because each of said components is compatible for operating said target hardware" device is considered non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the system. See *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 UPSQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

As for the personal inventory being selected for storage, functional recitation(s) using the word "for" or other functional language have been considered but are given little patentable

weight¹ because they fail to add any structural limitations and are thereby regarded as intended use language. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed product must result in a structural difference between the claimed product and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed product from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it reads on the claimed limitation. *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) (“The manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself.”); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). See also MPEP §§ 2114 and 2115. Unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner, the claim interpretation principles in this paragraph apply to all examined claims currently pending.

Further, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

6. Applicants argue that “the Examiner is incorrectly stating that the virtual warehouse website is within or on the target hardware device. Applicant’s virtual warehouse website storage is not located on the target hardware device nor do Applicant’s claim recite this”.

However, the claims do not indicate that the virtual warehouse and the target hardware are separate. The Examiner notes the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

¹ See e.g. *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)(stating that

7. In response to applicant's argument that the claims must be interpreted in light of Applicant's specification. It is true that the claims are interpreted in light of the specification; however, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

8. Applicants' argues that Russell does not teach the programming workstation in communication with separate from said target hardware. However, this feature is taught by Misra.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10. Claim 1 recites "a virtual warehouse website created specifically for a single end user"; however, it is unclear when the warehouse was created. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

11. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said target" in line 19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

12. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

although all limitations must be considered, not all limitations are entitled to patentable weight).

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

13. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not support the feature of “storing said license on behalf of said target device “until installation of said license on said target”. However, if Applicants disagree, please indicate where this is described.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 1-3, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0049679 to Russell et al. ("Russell") in view of US Patent No. 6189146 to Misra et al. ("Misra").

Referring to claim 1, Russell discloses a client site having a target hardware device (i.e. user-network enabled device), said hardware device having a unique identifier see paragraphs [0009] & [0049] – UND with hard drive serial number), a virtual warehouse website created specifically for a single end user (i.e. protected database, which is stored on a particular user-network enabled device) comprising a personal inventory of intangible software selected for

storage because each of said component is compatible with said target hardware device (see paragraphs [0011] & [0031]), a license generator generating a software site license comprising one or more of said components for said target hardware device, said software site license being stored in said virtual warehouse storage for later use (see paragraphs [0047] & [0045]) and a programming workstation in communication with said target hardware device (i.e. media player), said programming workstation displays said components of said end user virtual warehouse for said end user to select and confirm contents of said software site license (see paragraphs [0010] & [0054] and receiving said software site license from said virtual warehouse storage for said target device (see paragraphs [0012] & [0014]). Russell does not expressly disclose displaying to select and confirm contents of said software site license prior to license. However, this is an intended use feature and the Examiner notes that the workstation of Russell is capable of performing the process. "A recitation directed to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be used does not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art, if the prior art has the capability to so perform" (see MPEP 2114 and Ex parte Masham, "2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987)). Also, Russell does not expressly disclose the programming workstation is separate from said target hardware device and receiving said software site license from said virtual warehouse storage on behalf of said target device until installation of said license on said target. However, Misra discloses this feature (see fig. 1 and related text - the license server receives the license from the license generator and sends it to the client). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Russell to include the features of Misra. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it prevents issued license form being copied from one client

machine to another (see col. 3, lines 15-20). Also, modifying the reference to have more than one parts perform a task previously performed by one part is analogues to making functions, structures, or actions separable. It has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art (see *In re Dulberg*, 289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349 (CCPA 1961) and MPEP §2144.04 V.C).

Referring to claim 2, Russell discloses the system wherein said programming workstation receives an electronic file transfer comprising said license (see paragraph [0026]).

Referring to claim 3, Russell in combination with Misra discloses the system wherein said programming workstation retains a copy of said site license after installation (see claim 28 of Russell and fig. 1 of Misra).

Referring to claim 7, Russell discloses the system wherein said license sales site receives a purchase order from said client site comprising said target hardware device in response to said order, said license sales site establishes said virtual warehouse for said client site and places said licensable components for said target hardware device in said virtual warehouse (see claim 1 above).

Referring to claim 9, Russell discloses a representative of said client site (i.e. user) and a purchase order prepared by said representative and received at said license sales site, said order comprising said target hardware device, said representative having said programming workstation and installing said license to said target sales device prior to delivering said target to said client site (see claim 1 above).

16. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell and Misra as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7209902 to Stefik et al. ("Stefik").

Russell discloses a virtual warehouse and performing integrity check (see claim 1 above and paragraph [0063]). Russell does not expressly disclose the system wherein said virtual warehouse comprises a multi-password protected website comprising entry of a password unique to said client site and an ID unique to said target hardware device or comprising a priority level of access to said virtual warehouse. Stefik discloses the system wherein said virtual warehouse comprises a multi-password protected website comprising entry of a password unique to said client site and an ID unique to said target hardware device or comprising a priority level of access to said virtual warehouse (see claims 1 and 22). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Russell to include a virtual warehouse comprises a multi-password protected website comprising entry of a password unique to said client site and an ID unique to said target hardware device and a priority level of access to said virtual warehouse. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it prevents unauthorized individuals from accessing the system.

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jalatee Worjloh whose telephone number is 571-272-6714. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin Hewitt II can be reached on 571-272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:
10/675,684
Art Unit: 3685

Page 10

/Jalatee Worjloh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3685